



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

As regards the SACRIFICE OF THE MASS, we have proved—

1. That it is diametrically opposed to the teaching of the Scriptures, which emphatically declare that Christ was offered once for all, and by that one oblation of Himself made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world.

2. That the pretended distinction between the bloody sacrifice of the cross and the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass is utterly unfounded.

3. That the whole notion of a *Christian priesthood*, other than the eternal priesthood of Christ Himself, is opposed to Scripture.

With respect to PENANCE, we have proved—

1. That the early Church knew nothing of its being a Sacrament; and that Romanists are compelled to account for the silence of antiquity respecting it by appealing to the pretended *Disciplina Arcani*.

2. That Romanists themselves are not agreed as to its *Matter*; and that the *Form* assigned by the Council of Trent (sc., *ego te absolvo*) was not known in the Church for the first twelve centuries.

3. That the doctrine of *Attrition*, or imperfect Contrition, strikes at the root of all true repentance.

4. That it was not till the 13th century that *Auricular Confession* to a Priest, followed by absolution and satisfaction, was declared to be a law of the Church.

5. That the doctrine of *Satisfaction* rests upon a purely gratuitous hypothesis, wholly unfounded in Scripture, scil., that whilst the eternal penalties of sin are remitted to the penitent sinner in virtue of the merits of Christ, the temporal punishments must be endured by him either in this world or the next, unless he is able to avail himself of the treasury of superfluous merit which the Church has in her custody, and which she dispenses to those who can pay liberally for it.

As to EXTREME UNCTION, we have proved—

1. That the Fathers of Trent were uncertain as to its being instituted by Christ at all, and, accordingly, speak of it as being "*insinuated*" by St. Mark.

2. That the passage in St. James's Epistle, chap. v., so far from establishing the sacrament of Extreme Unction, is utterly inconsistent with it.

3. That its sacramental character was unheard of in the Church for many centuries, and not finally decreed by conciliar authority till the year 1439.

With respect to ORDERS, it has been shown—

That this so-called Sacrament has neither *matter* nor *form*, nor divine *institution*.

And as regards MATRIMONY, we have proved that it is wholly deficient in everything that can be thought to constitute a Sacrament; and that the only argument by which it is attempted to prove it a sacrament is a wretched quibble on the word "*sacramentum*," employed by the Vulgate in the translation of Eph., v. 32.

With respect to the INVOCATION OF SAINTS AND ANGELS, we have shown—

1. That it has no sanction from Holy Scripture, but is plainly opposed to its whole teaching, express and implied; especially,

2. That it ignores or sets aside the intercessory functions which Scripture represents Christ as now discharging at the right hand of God.

3. That it rests upon gross earthly analogies, which, when transferred to God and Christ, are equally dishonourable to both.

4. That it introduces a useless and cumbersome machinery for effecting what may be done immediately and by direct application at the throne of grace.

5. That it leads to practical idolatry, inasmuch as the thoughts and affections of the great mass of worshippers do not ascend beyond the benefactors through whose instrumentality they believe that their prayers are accepted and granted; and thus that the mediating creatures intercept the homage that should be rendered to God and Christ alone.

6. That the worship of the Virgin Mary especially has degenerated into rank idolatry, equal or even greater homage being paid to her than to Jesus Christ; and that the practical effect of the bull of Pope Pius IX. respecting the Immaculate Conception is to add a fourth person to the Christian Trinity.

7. That Mariolatry is without a shadow of countenance, either from the Scripture or the practice of the early Church, and that its origin is ultimately traceable to a sect of fanatical heretics in the 4th century.

As to the WORSHIP OF IMAGES, we have shown—

1. That however explained, it flatly contradicts the most explicit and emphatic statements of holy Scripture.

2. That it was unknown in the early Church, the absence of it being one of the characteristic notes of Christianity, as distinguished from the religions of heathenism.

3. That it was gradually introduced into the Church through a corrupt imitation of Paganism.

4. That it almost inevitably leads to gross idolatry among the vulgar, who know nothing of *dulia*, *hyperdulia*, and *latraria*; and who cannot perceive or else disregard the fine distinctions drawn by speculative theologians between the worship paid to the image and to the being whom it represents.

With respect to PURGATORY, we have proved—

1. That the doctrine has no foundation in holy Scripture, but is positively repugnant to its letter and spirit.

2. That in its present form it was not known in the Church for the first six centuries.

3. That a large part of the Church, viz., the Greek Church, has never received it.

4. That it was borrowed from Paganism.

5. That it is utterly inconsistent with other Romish dogmas.

6. That the *Prayers for the Dead* which we read of in the early history of the Church had no reference whatsoever to an intermediate state like that of the Romish Purgatory.

As regards the doctrine of INDULGENCES, we have proved—

1. That when the Council of Trent declares that the power of granting Indulgences was given by Christ to His Church, it states what is not the fact; and, on the contrary, that the whole notion on which the doctrine rests is utterly opposed to the teaching of God's written word.

2. That the doctrine of Indulgences being intimately connected with the dogma of Purgatory could not have been invented earlier than the latter, and, in point of fact, was not heard of till about the 10th century.

3. That the Indulgences of which we read in early ecclesiastical history were of a totally different kind; and that the Church of Rome has in this, as in several other cases, practised a gross deception by confounding similarity of name with similarity of meaning.

Such is a very brief and imperfect recapitulation of some of the points which have been *proved* in the pages of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. A glance at our Indexes will show that we have proved a great deal more respecting each topic of controversy than what has been now enumerated. But even this short outline ought to be sufficient to make any honest Roman Catholic pause and ask himself, Am I safe in continuing a member of a Church which numbers among her Articles of Faith some doctrines which cannot be proved either by Scripture or the authority of the early Church, and some which appear plainly opposed to both? May the Spirit of God bring this question home to the heart and conscience of every candid inquirer after truth!

One word in conclusion. In all our controversial discussions our great object has been to fulfil the Apostle's injunction, "To speak the truth in love." We have laboured to set forth the truth fully, and fearlessly, and lovingly. We have felt it to be our solemn duty on the one hand to "extenuate nothing," and, on the other, not to "set down aught in malice." We have all through been impressed with a deep conviction that we were dealing with topics in which God's glory and the interests of immortal souls were at stake. We now withdraw, for the present, from the field in which we have so long toiled, committing the result to Him whose written Word we have taken as our great rule and guide: trusting to His own most gracious promise:—"As the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it" (Isaiah lv. 10, 11.)

Correspondence.

DID THE HOLY FATHERS ACKNOWLEDGE THE POPE'S SUPREMACY?

In closing our labours it is, of course, necessary that we should devote what space we can, to wind up our somewhat protracted discussion with Dr. Geraghty.

That discussion has now been continued for a whole year, during which time it is reasonable to conclude that that gentleman has brought forward the best arguments and authorities he could in favour of his opinions.

Whether he has grappled with our arguments in a manner satisfactory to men of manly and candid minds, we must leave it to our readers, present and future, to judge. That we have endeavoured to discuss his arguments and quotations in a straightforward and candid manner we fearlessly assert, and his letters have also given us an opportunity of bringing forward not a few important matters of ecclesiastical history, which we would scarcely have found room for in a more systematic and consecutive form. We thank Dr. Geraghty, accordingly, for the service he has done us in this particular. If he had been able to detect in our seven volumes as many inaccuracies as we have done in as many of his letters, we should have retired from the stage of controversy under feelings of shame, instead of the pride we do feel—and, we hope, a justifiable and honourable pride—at the correctness and fidelity of our statements and quotations. If our volumes shall live, as we confidently believe they will, they will, probably, be most prized by posterity for their accuracy and candour.

Let it not be supposed, however, that we undervalue Dr. Geraghty's talents or acquirements, because he has not succeeded better in support of his opinions. Considering the intractable character of the materials with which he had to work, we think he really showed no little ingenuity and adroitness in the management of them; and we doubt much whether there is a controversialist in the present day on the Roman Catholic side who could have

done it better. But what can the most experienced or skilful advocate do, when the witnesses he has at his command either shoot wide of the mark, or wholly break down under a searching cross-examination? Dr. Geraghty may be to be blamed for having espoused, or pitied for having been educated in, a creed which neither historically or theologically will stand the test of close examination; but having once espoused it, and committed himself to its defence, we cannot bring ourselves to criticize his performances by the same standard, that we should feel at liberty, and, indeed, called upon to do, if we believed that he had *truth* upon his side. What would be unpardonable trifling, and insufferable sophistry, if brought forward on the side of truth, may be very clever and dexterous ingenuity when adduced in defence of error. We only wonder how any man of intelligence could delude himself, much less think he could convince others, by reasonings so inconclusive; or blind his own understanding to the difficulties which beset on every side the theory he has adopted. We suppose it is only to be accounted for by reflecting that minds educated in the belief that it is *virtue* to believe implicitly, and *sin* to question, whatever is taught by ecclesiastical authority, do not know how to give fair play to their own minds, much less to those of others, and actually lose the power of close thought and accurate reasoning in their mistakenly *pious* struggle to uphold what they originally adopted on the authority of others, without examination. Those who have been educated in a freer school, and accustomed to a purer atmosphere, should be grateful to God that they have the enjoyment of the full use of their reasoning faculties, undimmed and unclouded by the fogs of hereditary error, and should rather feel compassion than enmity or anger towards those whose mental vision has been jaundiced by prejudice or stunted by early education. We freely forgive Dr. Geraghty any offences which he may from time to time have committed in our pages against Christian charity and love, and we shall never cease to pray that his eyes may, ere it is too late, be opened to the fatal delusions of the creed he has struggled so earnestly, and, we believe, conscientiously, to support.

We have still, however, a long string of quotations to deal with, and we proceed briefly to consider such of them as appear to us to be most deserving of consideration. Hitherto we have proceeded *seriatim et verbatim* in the exact order in which the writer himself arranged his authorities; we must now, however, divide and distinguish them in the only manner which the limits still at our command will permit.

Dr. Geraghty, for instance, quotes as authorities several Popes of the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th centuries; but as we have already declined to receive the Bishops of Rome of *earlier* centuries as competent witnesses in their own cause, we cannot waste our space by encumbering it with testimonies which, even if multiplied *ad infinitum*, would obviously prove nothing. Popes, we admit, were ever making grand and arrogant assumptions of pre-eminence and authority; but the matter of importance is not what *they* claimed, but what other Churches accorded to them: and we have already proved by a variety of instances that these assumptions were vigorously resisted by other Churches during the first four centuries, wherever they found it necessary to do so to preserve their own privileges and independence. From that time, as other Churches declined, the Church of Rome gained further and further power by encroachment, until the 9th century, when, after losing half the Christian world by the Greek schism, she tardily obtained, after a long struggle, something approaching, at least, to a *real supremacy* over all that remained to her in the West, until the Reformation dawned and relieved from her iron grasp no inconsiderable portion of the fairest kingdoms of Europe.

For these reasons we pass over long passages cited by Dr. Geraghty from Pope Boniface I., A.D. 422; Pope Xystus, 433; Pope Leo, 446; Pope Gelasius, 492; Pope Vigilius, 538; Pope Pelagius II., 580; Pope Gregory, 596; Pope Martin, 650; Pope Hadrian, 737; Pope Gregory IV., 830; leaving it to those who have a liking for *interested* witnesses to peruse their writings for themselves. And we proceed to consider those of Dr. G.'s remaining authorities, which appear to us most deserving of attention, without noticing others of minor importance in so grave a controversy. It seems, indeed, scarcely necessary to observe, that if the great fathers of the first four centuries do not prove his case, it would be strange if any evidence of comparatively obscure writers of the 6th, 7th, or 8th century could establish it.

(Continued from page 120.)

XLIV. St. Augustine and the Council of Carthage, anno 417, to Pope Zozimus—"We know we should communicate our proceedings to your clemency, that to them may be added the authority of the Apostolic See."—Epis. xxvi., Galland, viii., p. 590.

[We know not on what authority Dr. Geraghty attributes this epistle to St. Augustine. Galland gives the names of 67 Bishops present at this Council and joining in this letter, but St. Augustine's name is not among them. Dr. G. is also in error in stating that it was addressed to Pope Zozimus in 417. If Galland, from whom Dr. G. purports to cite, be correct, of which there can be no doubt, it was addressed, not to Zozimus, but

to Pope Innocent, Zozimus's predecessor. These matters may not be very material, but controversialists should be accurate in matters of ecclesiastical history, especially when dealing with such a name as St. Augustine's. What, however, does such a passage prove? The Council of Carthage was writing to Innocent about the heretics, Pelagius and Celestius (mentioned already in No. XL., p. 131, *supra*), whom they themselves had condemned by their own authority, and they naturally wished to have the concurrence of Rome, so that its authority might "be added" to theirs. The letter in question addresses Pope Innocent as our Lord and brother, "domine frater," just as St. Ambrose did Siricius (see No. XXXIII., p. 130, *supra*). As to the blunder made by Pope Zozimus about these very men, and the pertinacity of the African Bishops in persevering in and repeating their sentence in opposition to Zozimus, see *supra*, p. 131, No. XL.]

XLV. St. Augustine to Optatus—"Pelagius and Celestius, the authors of this heresy, have been by Councils, conspiring with Christ, who protects His Church, also by two prelates, Innocent and Zozimus, of the Apostolic See, condemned by the whole Christian world." For, "says he, "already two Councils on this subject have been referred [missa, sent. II. C.L.] to the Apostolic See, whence rescripts have been issued. The cause is ended: would that the heresy may soon end also" ^c. Lastly, "These men," says he, "are these heretics had been condemned by the sentence of the Apostolic See, were notorious, but now they are silenced." (Epis. xcii., Sixto, tom. ii., col. 1064.)

[The two Councils here referred to were those of Carthage, already mentioned, and Milevis; and as Pelagius and his companion were condemned by both Africa and Rome, St. Augustine right well consider the "cause ended." If Zozimus had persevered in his error in exculpating Pelagius and Celestius, in opposition to the Councils of Carthage and Milevis, and the African Bishops had yielded their opinions to his, and St. Augustine had then said "the case is ended," it would have been, doubtless, a strong testimony in favour of Papal supremacy; but as it was Pope Zozimus who thought fit to change his opinion, and adopt those of the Africans, and they were, therefore, all agreed, the question of supremacy of Rome over Carthage did not even arise. If it had arisen, there is no reason to doubt that it would have been in Africa decided against Rome. See the case of Apianus, and his appeal to the same Pope Zozimus, in our article on the Church of Africa, p. 2, *supra*.]

XLVI. In the ardent dispute between the two Patriarchs—St. Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius of Constantinople—before the Council of Ephesus had met, St. Cyril thus writes to Pope Celestine concerning Nestorius:—"As the long established custom of the Church requires that these things be communicated to your holiness, I therefore write," &c. He concludes thus:—"Please to determine whether we should communicate with him (Nestorius) or reject him; and let all the East know your mind, that we may all, united, stand up for the right faith" (tom. vi., Epis. 9, p. 36).

[It was, of course, not only right that matters of such grave moment, and affecting the purity of the faith of the Church, should be communicated to the Patriarch of Rome, who was acknowledged to be the first place, but also most desirable that he and the Patriarch of Alexandria should hold the same views, and "united stand up for the right faith;" and who can doubt that the emergency required all their united efforts, when heresy had sprung up even in the very seat of imperial government, Constantinople or New Rome, and that the person of its Patriarch himself. But St. Cyril expressly treats Celestine in this letter as his *fel low minister*, a one who required to be both informed and stimulated to act in the matter. The whole letter, indeed, is so interesting and illustrative of the state of things at that period, that we think it may be very useful to abstract and translate it for the benefit of those who have not ready access to the original Greek.

Cyril begins by informing Celestine that "he had long preserved a deep silence about Nestorius, the Archbishop of Constantinople, and had neither written to him (Celestine) nor to any other of his fellow-ministers" on the subject, reflecting that precipitous was usually wrong in matters so serious. That, however, things had come to such extremities, that he thought it proper to break silence and communicate every thing which had taken place to him, as *divine prudence required*, and long custom in the Church persuaded him to do. That, although he (Cyril) had exhorted Nestorius to repudiate the perverse doctrines which he had been promoting, both among his own flock and to the multitude of strangers who were accustomed to congregate at Constantinople, as well in his public homilies as otherwise, hitherto he could not influence him in the least, but, on the contrary, a certain Bishop, named Dorotheus (a man whom he describes as inordinately given to flattery for the sake of gain, and ready with his tongue even to rashness dilately, during the actual celebration of divine service while Nestorius was present in the Cathedral Church), and with a

loud voice dared to cry out, "Anathema to him who would call Mary Theotokos;" which had created great scandal and dissension, so that many had refused any longer to hold communion with him. That fearing that these homilies of Nestorius, which had been brought into his own country (Egypt), should mislead men of light and simple minds, who were already beginning to discuss among themselves whether these opinions of Nestorius were right or not, he (Cyril) had written a Catholic epistle to the monasteries of Egypt to confirm them in the faith. That some copies of this letter had found their way to Constantinople, and had been of such assistance to many there, that several of the magistrates had written to thank him for it. That this very thing, however, had fomented Nestorius's anger against him, and made him attack him (Cyril) as his chief enemy. That, nevertheless, committing all things to God, he had again written a letter to Nestorius, containing a brief compendium of true faith, sincerely admonishing him to conform to it; but that it had done no good, as he still persevered in the same perverse opinions. Cyril then goes on to inform Celestine that the Eastern Bishops, and especially those of Macedonia, did not approve of these doctrines, but were grieved and offended at them. That Nestorius, nevertheless, thought himself wiser than all others, and, swelling with pride, though he could not be ignorant that all the orthodox throughout the world, whether bishops or laity, confessed that Christ was God, and that the Virgin who bore him was "Theotokos," actually dreamt that he alone understood the mystery of Christ, and thought that by his insidious measures and the power of his See he could even succeed in getting him (Cyril) and all others to subscribe to his opinions. What, therefore, shall we do; since we can neither induce him to repent or desist from such harangues? The people of Constantinople are more and more corrupted every day; and labouring under this great mortal disease, daily and eagerly expect the aid of orthodox teachers. Nor is it safe any longer to maintain silence. What, therefore, shall we, who have undertaken the ministry of the word, and had the care of the faith entrusted to us, say in the day of judgment, if we hold our peace at these things? We would not publicly and openly abandon his communion before we first informed you of these things. Deign, therefore, to tell us what you think right, by which we may clearly see whether we ought to communicate with him or publicly denounce him, so that no one shall communicate with any who encourage or preach erroneous doctrines of this kind. Moreover, a mind of your integrity ought to set forth by letter your opinion in this matter, both to the most pious Bishops of Macedonia and of the whole East. For we shall thereby give an opportunity to all those who desire it to continue, steadfast in the one mind, and give assistance to the true faith, which is thus attacked. As far as is in the power of Nestorius, both we and all the Fathers who have called the blessed Virgin "Theotokos" are attacked by the same anathema. For though he has not with his own mouth done it, he sat by and listened; nay, he induced and suborned another, Dorotheus, of whom I have already spoken, to do so; and immediately after he had descended from his episcopal throne, he communicated with him in the celebration of the divine mysteries. But, in order more clearly to make known to your holiness not only what he says and thinks, but what our blessed fathers have handed down to us, I send you some volumes, containing parts of some of the chapters, which I have caused to be translated into Latin, as well as those could do it who live at Alexandria. I have also delivered my own letters to Possidonus, with directions to deliver them to your holiness.^d

We think this letter, while it clearly shows the prudence of Cyril, who fails to prove the supremacy of Celestine. But our readers will judge.]

XLVII.—At the general Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, the Roman legate declares—"It is a thing known to all ages that St. Peter, head of the Apostles, who is the pillar of faith, and is the foundation of the Catholic Church, received from Christ the keys, and had the power of loosing and binding sins given him, and who now and always lives in his successors, and exercises his authority; whose successor, Celestine, having his place, sent us to this Council." St. Cyril, having heard this declaration, moved that, "as they had fulfilled what was ordered them by Celestine," they would depose Nestorius; and the holy Council said, Since the legates of the Apostolic See have said what is fitting, it follows that they should also subscribe and confirm the acts.¹ Sentence is then passed on Nestorius in these words: "Forced by the canons and by the epistle of our most holy father, Celestine of Rome, we pronounce this doleful sentence."²

[Whether Philip the Presbyter, who was one of the legates of Celestine, did say what is here reported, or whether

¹ "τὴν παρὰ τῶν ὄρθοδόξων διδασκάλων ἐπικου-
πίαν."

² "διὸ δὴ καταξιωσον τυπωσαι τὸ δοκοῦν."—Labbe and Coss. iii., 343.

³ Cyril, Oper., tom. v., pt. 2. Epist. 8, p. 36. Paris, 1638.
Labbe and Coss., tom. iii., p. 330. Paris, 1671.

⁴ Mani IV., 1299.

⁵ Labbe, tom. 3, p. 533.

this, like many other things, was interpolated in after times into the account of the proceedings, may be fairly doubted; but, assuming that he did so, it is obvious the occasion was one upon which no one present was likely to take offence at a mere piece of magniloquence on the part of one of the agents of an absent prelate of the highest dignity, who was aiding them cordially in doing what required all their united power to effect—i.e., deposing the Patriarch of the imperial city of Constantinople, at that time holding the second place in the whole Church, as the See of *New Rome*. Cyril, of all others, who had personally invoked the aid of Celestine, as we have seen by his letter just given, was the last who could have envied at anything his legates chose to assert of his high dignity. The sentence of the Council, however, goes much farther than the abstract of it given by Dr. Geraghty; for it expressly calls Celestine their *fel low minister* (*καλλιεργόν, com-ministri, Labbe, p. 533*), and shows also that they based their decisions not merely on the opinion of Celestine, and the canons, but upon *their own examination* of the published doctrines of Nestorius, which they found to be impious (Idem, p. 623).

It is also a mistranslation to put it into St. Cyril's mouth that "they had fulfilled all that was ordered them by St. Celestine." The original word is *οἰσθεντα*, which means pointed out or defined, not "ordered."

We may also observe that this Council was not convened by the legates of Celestine, but by that of the Emperor, as, indeed, is distinctly admitted and stated by the legates themselves. (Idem, p. 626.)

XI.VIII. In the East, Theodore, Bishop of Cyrus, anno 420, whom a synod at Ephesus had arraigned, appeals, A.D. 450, to St. Leo:—"If Paul repaire to Peter for an explanation, how much more should we hasten to your Apostolic throne to receive from you a cure for the wounded Churchs. For to you belongs the primacy in all things. We supplicate your holiness, protect the storm-tossed Churches of God. I await the sentence of your Apostolic throne, and implore your holiness to aid me, who appeal to you."⁶ And again, to the Roman legate Renatus:—"I beseech you to move the most holy Bishop to use his *Apostolic power*, &c.; for that most holy throne hath the supremacy over all the Churches in the world."

[We may observe, in the first place, that the word which Dr. G. here has taken on himself to translate "supremacy" is *ἡγεμονία*, which signifies mere "leadership" just as properly as sovereignty. The word which he translates "primacy" is *πρωτεία*, which signifies merely the "first" place or precedence, which was never denied to him. There is, moreover, no word in either of these letters which justifies the translation "who appeal to you." Nor does Theodore say "I await your sentence," but merely "πρωτείαν ψῆφον"—I await your *vote* or *suffrage*; *ψῆφος* signifies literally a "pebble," or "little stone," such as those used in the ballot. The Greeks, it is well known, acquitted with a white stone, and condemned with a black one, as the ballot is in more modern times conducted by white and black beans. This was ancient even in the days of Ovid.

"Mos est antiquus, niveis atrisque lapillis,
His damare reos, illis absolvere culpa."

—Metam. xv., 453.

What Theodore asked of Leo was aid and assistance ("opem et auxilium"). He complains of the pseudo-Synod of Ephesus as having wronged him grievously, and most unjustly deprived him of his see (Cyrus, in Syria), though absent, uncited, and unquestioned as to his opinions concerning the incarnation of our God and Saviour. That he had hoped that an end would have been put to the storm by the instrumentality of those whom Leo had sent to Ephesus; but that he had fallen into a more severe tempest since. He then proceeds, not to *appeal*, but to ask Leo's advice and counsel, whether he should acquiesce or not in this unrighteous sentence and unjust deposition; or (as appears from his other letters, which we shall presently refer to) petition the Emperor to call a general Council to enable him to appeal to it.

In a subsequent letter to the Patrician Anatolius, it appears that he had made up his mind to such appeal; for he beseeches "his magnificence" to ask leave of the Emperor that he might come into the West, and there be judged by the most holy Bishops, and "if I should be seen to bend in the least degree from the rule of faith, may I be cast into the depths of the sea."⁷ In another letter to the same Anatolius, he says:—"What I desire is, not restoration to my See of Cyrus, which I never wish to see again, but merely to clear myself of the charge of heresy," &c.⁸ That what he desired was that the Emperor should convene a Council also appears from the same volume, pp. 1012, 1013, and 1015. The epistle of Theodore to Renatus states, moreover, the grounds of the leadership or precedence which he attributes to the See of Rome, which he refers, not to any divine institution, but, "among many other things, to *this, above all others*, that it had remained free from heretical taint; that no one holding contrary opinions had ever sat

⁶ Tom. iii., Ep. cxiii., Leon.

⁷ Ibid. Ep. cxvi.

⁸ Epis. 119, Oper., tom. iii., p. 992. "Magnitudinem tuam obtemperare hanc a victore Augusto gratiam petat, ut in Occidente veniamque a Deo carissimis sanctissimisque Episcopis judicer; ac si vel minimum a fidel regula deflectere videar, in medium maris profundum dejectar."

⁹ Epist. 138, p. 1012.

^a The reader will do well to consult here Dr. Ecl. Hist., vol. i., p. 239, Life of Pope Innocent I.

^b Epis. cxc., tom. ii., col. 1060 [p. 706, Ben. 1].

^c Sermo. cxxxi., tom. v., 930 [p. 645, Ben. Ec.]

^d "Ἐτε μὲν πρὸς ἔτερον τῶν συλλεγοῦντων."

in it; and that it had preserved the Apostolic grace entire."

XLIX. The Council of Chalcedon—"Peter hath spoken through Leo."¹ "Thus has Cyril taught."² Eternal be his memory. "The illustrious judges said, All doubt is removed respecting Theodoret; for he hath renounced Nestorius, and hath been received by Leo."

[Dr. G. might as well have given the whole passage here from Evagrius, when he deserts Labbe and Cossart, and Mansi's records of the Councils, to pick out a few words from that author: "This is the faith of the Fathers—this the faith of the *Apóstoles*. Anathema to him who does not thus believe. Peter has uttered these words through Leo. Leo has taught truly and piously: thus has Cyril taught. The teaching of Leo and Cyril is the same. Anathema to him who does not thus believe, &c."³]

What was this but to say, that as Leo and Cyril agree with one another, and with both the *Apóstoles* and the Fathers, we are quite safe in following such authority, and we do so? Eternal glory to Cyril for so teaching.]

Labbe and Coss. t. iv, p. 620-4, and Mansi t. vii, p. 187, &c., give a very graphic account of the 8th Session of the Council of Chalcedon, in which Theodoret was restored to his See. It appears from the speech of the four Legates that Pope Leo had already and recently *received him into his communion*, as Leo's own letters testified.⁴ Yet so far was this determination of Leo from satisfying the Council, that they insisted on further proof of his orthodoxy, and would accept no other than a public anathematization of Nestorius. The following is a literal translation of what is reported to have occurred at this 8th Session, which our readers may consider a pendant to our former articles on the Council of Chalcedon, *supra*, pp. 37 and 50.

"The most reverend Bishops cried out, 'Let Theodoret now anathematize him (Nestorius).'"

The most reverend Theodoret then, coming forward into the midst of the Council, said—

"I presented my petition to the most divine and pious Emperor, and I presented articles (libellos) to the most reverend Bishops, the substitutes of the most reverend Archbishop Leo; and if it seems good to you, let them be read before you, that you may know what my opinions are."

The most reverend Bishops cried out—

"We will not have anything read—only anathematize Nestorius."

The most reverend Theodoret said—

"I was by the power of God brought up by orthodox people, educated in orthodoxy, and I preached orthodoxy, and I not only dislike and consider aliens Nestorius and Eutyches, but every man who does not believe rightly."

When he said these things, the most reverend Bishops cried out—

"Speak plainly—anathematize Nestorius and his doctrines—anathematize Nestorius and his followers."

The most reverend Theodoret said—

"I should not speak the truth, unless I knew in what manner I should please God. In the first place, I would satisfy you that I am neither thinking of my See, nor do I value honours, nor have I come here on that account; but because I suffered calumny, I came here to satisfy you that I am orthodox, and I will anathematize every heretic who refuses to be converted, and I will anathematize Nestorius and Eutyches, and every other man who says, as they say, that there are two Sons."

When he said this, the most reverend Bishops again cried out—

"Speak plainly—anathematize Nestorius and those who hold his opinions."

The most reverend Bishop Theodoret replied—

"Unless I may explain what I believe, I will not speak. I believe, however"

When he said this the most reverend Bishops cried out—

"He is a heretic! he is a Nestorian! Turn the heretic out of doors!"

The most reverend Bishop Theodoret then said—"Anathema to Nestorius, and to him who refuses to call the Virgin Mary θεοτόκος, and who separates the only begotten Son into two sons. But I have subscribed the definition of faith, and the letter of the most holy and God-beloved Lord Archbishop Leo, and such is my opinion. Farewell."⁵

The most glorious judges said—

"All doubt is at an end about the most reverend Bishop Theodoret; for he has anathematized Nestorius before us, and has been *received into communion* by holy Leo, Archbishop of Old Rome, and has freely accepted the definition of faith approved of by you; and, moreover, has subscribed the letter of the holy Archbishop Leo. It, therefore, only remains that sentence should be passed by your reverences, that he should receive back his see, as the holy Archbishop Leo has declared to be right."⁶ (εὐκαωστέρευτον)

All the most reverend Bishops cried out:—

"Theodoret is worthy of his see. Let the Church receive its orthodox pastor—let it receive its orthodox

teacher. Theodoret is worthy of his see. Long life to Archbishop Leo—Leo has acted justly (εὐκαωστός) and according to the will of God. Let the people receive the orthodox, worthy of his throne. Let his Church be restored to Bishop Theodoret.

The prelates then proceeded to give their suffrages singly.

Anatolius, Bishop of Constantinople, said—"The most reverend Bishop Theodoret has demonstrated his orthodoxy in every way; but *chiefly because he has anathematized Nestorius, &c.*; therefore, let him as justice requires be restored to his see.

Maximus, Bishop of Antioch, said—"I already, indeed, and from the beginning, knew that the most reverend Bishop Theodoret was Catholic, having heard his doctrines in the most holy Church. But much more now I receive his holiness, because he has just now anathematized Nestorius and Eutyches, and believes according to the definition of faith expounded by this Council itself (not a word about Leo or his judgment in the matter). Wherefore, I decree, according to the custom, that he is Bishop of the city of Cyrus."

Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, then said—"And I consent to the same things which Anatolius, the most beloved of God, Bishop of Constantinople, has decreed. (Why not what Leo has decreed?)

The whole Council then cried out that it was a right judgment, a right decree. We all say the same things.

And the most glorious judges said—"According to the decree of this holy Council, let the most holy Bishop Theodoret be restored to his see of Cyrus."

But all was not yet ended; for three of the Bishops, Sophonius, Bishop of Constance, John, Bishop of Germanica, and Amphilochius, Bishop of Sida, having apparently been more *taciturn* than pleased the *most reverend* assembly,

The most reverend Bishops then cried out—

"Let Sophonius now anathematize!" and he did so accordingly.

"Let John now anathematize!" and he did so also.

"Let Amphilochius anathematize!" and he did so.

Whereupon, the "most glorious and magnificent" judges said—

"Everything has now been taken care of by the holy Synod. This is a time for all to preserve concord."

And so the 8th Session broke up.]

L. St. Leo exercises his authority over the Patriarch Anatolius,⁷ and threatens to excommunicate him in spite of the Council of Constantinople, till Anatolius at last yields to Leo, and confesses, "I will fulfil these things by obeying you, &c.,"⁸ and adds that the making Constantinople the second see had been reserved for Leo's decision. "The whole force and confirmation," says he, "of our acts shall be deferred to the authority of your holiness."⁹ Lastly, Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, having been deposed, appealed to St. Leo,¹⁰ says Liberatus (in *Breviar. 12*).

[We must here express our surprise that Dr. G. should have ventured on such an assertion as that Leo exercised *authority* over Anatolius, after our article headed, "How did Pope Leo and his successors deal with the 28th article of the Council of Chalcedon?" (*supra*, p. 50-52.) We must beg to refer our readers to it, as demonstrating the impotence, not the authority, of Pope Leo as against the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon. As to Anatolius's letter, it was obviously written in the hope of conciliating, or, perhaps, deluding, Leo, who, it must be admitted, was the ablest and most energetic Pope who had ever, up to that period, presided at Rome.

To understand, however, the amount of weight due to this letter, it is necessary to be a little further acquainted with his history. Anatolius appears to have been a man of very indifferent character, who owed his consecration to an equivocal source, viz., those concerned in the proceedings of the pseudo-Council of Ephesus; and Leo, in his letters, takes great credit to himself for recognizing him a true Bishop at all, and that out of deference to his imperial patron, and the peace of the Church over which he presided. Anatolius, nevertheless, subsequently roused the anger of Leo to such an extent¹¹ that the Emperor Marcian interfered, and towards the close of the year 453 intimated to Leo that Anatolius was prepared to satisfy him as to his soundness in all matters concerning the faith.

Anatolius then writes the letter referred to by Dr. G., in which he alludes to the wishes of the Emperor, and says not that he "will fulfil these things by obeying you," but "when the Emperor read your letters to me, I fulfilled your wishes, by restoring Acutius the archdeacon (whom he, Anatolius, had very scandalously removed, to make way for his friend Andrew, a notorious Monophysite.) He also tells him that he had sent from his presence all companions and officials who had taken part against his predecessor Flavian, or were even suspected of any sympathy with the "execrable" Eutyches. Considering, therefore, he says, how greatly the pious Emperor would rejoice,

¹ Ep. ev. ad. Pulcher. ep. evl. ad Anatol.

² Anatol. ad Leonem.

³ Ibid.

⁴ See a detailed account of the whole matter in Mr. Greenwood's recent and able work on the *Catharsis Petri*, p. 412-419.

⁵ His own words are—"Quia tamen plissimus principes vestrae beatitudinis litteras mihi subiegit, ea statim quae continebuntur eis, ut placita vobis impliri, quod ne facere vel communis pacis utilitas, vel quod decuerat, hortabatur".

and how much it would profit the universal Church if by any means harmony could be restored, he besought him, as his *fellow Bishop*,¹² speedily to write to him (Anatolius); protesting that the resolution at the Council of Chalcedon on behalf of the Church of Constantinople was not owing to any fault of his, but the result of an unanimous vote of the clergy of Constantinople and the neighbouring countries, and always with the understanding that the confirmation of all that was done should be referred to him (Leo).

"The submission of Anatolius," as is well observed by Mr. Greenwood, "cleverly enough evaded all allusions to the grounds on which Pope Leo would most have wished him to rest it. The authority of St. Peter's chair, the presumed infraction of the Nicene decrees, are not even remotely alluded to. The tone of the letter is apologetic rather than penitential; the writer avoids every pledge that might involve his Church or affect the credit of the Chalcedonian decrees, otherwise than as he himself understood or was personally concerned in procuring them

And, in fact, though Anatolius permitted Leo to place his foot on his individual neck, his Church passively, but resolutely, rejected the Papal influence. The decree of Chalcedon was irrevocably recorded upon the statute books of the Church: the privilege thereby granted was not to the bishop, but to his see, and there was none to which the succeeding patriarchs adhered with more inflexible resolution (p. 418)."

Father Quesnel, in like manner, in his notes and observations, printed in the second volume of the works of Leo,¹³ observing upon this epistle of Anatolius to Leo, says—"While Leo charges him with attempting things which were against the canons, we read no admission of the kind in Anatolius's letter, which appears to me to be framed with such art, that it might appear fully to satisfy the complaints of Leo, while in truth it gave up none of his rights as *Archbishop of Constantinople*. For he scarcely alludes towards the end of it, in a few words, to the 28th canon of Chalcedon, about which he only wished Leo to take it for certain that he was not personally in fault, and that he was very far from wishing to covet what belonged to others; and the Eastern Bishops in fact held it as such a settled point that they would never recede from this canon, that when Julian, Bishop of Coos (Leo's resident legate) read, in a meeting of Bishops at Constantinople, the first part of a letter of Leo's (No. 114, p. 1194), confirming all that had been done in the Council of Chalcedon in *matters of faith*, he did not venture to read the second part of that letter, in which Leo refused to ratify the 28th canon, as contrary, in his opinion, to the Canons of Nice. Leo complains of his having done this in his letter to Julian.¹⁴ As to Flavian of Constantinople's supposed appeal to Leo, Dupin has clearly proved the reverse in his treatise *De antiqua*, Disc. p. 218, to which we refer our readers.]

Having thus considered *fitly* of Dr. Geraghty's best authorities in favour of the only doctrine of the Church of Rome which he has thought fit to defend—the Papal Supremacy—we think our readers will agree with us that they lose nothing by our not having it in our power to travel farther with him into the 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th centuries. If the doctrine was not held by the Church Catholic during the first 500 years after the coming of our Lord, we really care little whether it grew up, or was "developed," in the 6th or the 10th century. It is enough for us that it was not a doctrine handed down among those "once delivered to the saints" by our Lord or His Apostles. We view the *affirmative* of the proposition to be wholly unproved by any such evidence as could be received, much less acted on, in any court of justice where the laws of evidence are known and understood; and we hold the *negative* to be proved with well nigh the rigourousness of a mathematical demonstration.

If any one who has read through what we have published on this question still thinks otherwise, his mind must be, in our humble judgment, constructed in so peculiar a manner as to make, as far as he is concerned, arguments vain, and history a fable. For ourselves, we can only say, that the more we examine and study, either the sacred Scriptures or the records and monuments of ecclesiastical history, the more deeply convinced we are, that a greater delusion was never imposed upon any section of the human race; than the belief that the supreme authority claimed by the Church of Rome had its origin in the institutions of Christ or His Apostles.

One word more to set ourselves right with Dr. Geraghty. Our readers will remember that in our October number, p. 119, we showed that his statement, No. XXV., that Damasus had "showed his supremacy in deposing Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople" (for which he cited as his authority the ecclesiastical historian, Theodoret, lib. v. c. 9.), was utterly unfounded. He has since, in a private letter to our respected friend, Mr. Collette, of London, charged us with want of courtesy and fairness in causing this exposure to be printed, after he had civilly requested us to suppress it, and substitute the instance where Pope Damasus deposes the Oriental prelates, Apolinarius and Timotheus, of Laodicea, as related by Theodoret, lib. v. c. 10."

Now, we should be really sorry consciously to deny a *locus ponentiae* to any gentleman who did us the favour to enter

¹ The letter is addressed—"Sanctissimo et beatissimo COEPISCOPO Papae Leonis.

² Opera Leonis Magni. Venet., 1756, tom. ii., p. 1547.

³ Epis. 127, p. 1248.

into controversy with us, though we do think it was rather unpardonable carelessness to say *Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, when he meant Timothy, of Laodicea*. We can assure Dr. G. that we were utterly innocent of any such intention. Our October number was published many days before we had the slightest idea that Dr. G. wished to retract anything he had written. Nor have we been able to find, after a diligent search amongst our multitudinous papers, any trace whatever of an intimation that he wished to correct his error, as stated in his letter to Mr. Collette. We are quite sure, and assert it on the good faith of a gentleman, that we never *read* such a letter from Dr. G.; nor do we believe we ever received any such prior to the 25th October, six days after the October number was published, when, in requesting us to make a correction in his version of "St. Basil's letter to Damasus," before putting it into type (which we readily did, and Dr. G. subsequently acknowledged and thanked us for), he complained that we had not allowed him to correct his error about Flavian in No. XXV. If he did so complain, we either never received his letter, or must have mislaid it without reading it, which is perfectly possible, as we never undertake to notice any letters which reach us after the first of the month in which we publish. We hope this will, at least, satisfy Dr. G. that we did not *intentionally* act unhandsomely by even an opponent who has not treated us with any unusual courtesy even in this very matter.

To show, however, further, that we had no reason for suppressing his correction, had we received it, we may say that the fact, which he states he wished to substitute, is quite as unsatisfactory as the supposed deposition of *Flavian*. The ecclesiastical historian, Dupin, in his life of Damasus (vol. i. Ecc. Hist., p. 227, Dub. Ed.), thus refers to it—"The Bishops of the East having desired Damasus to condemn Timothy, a disciple of Apollinaris, received this answer, that he was condemned long ago by a Council at Rome, *in the presence of Peter of Alexandria*. This letter is recited by Theodoret in ch. 10 of the 5th book of his History, and was written about the year 378."

We have also looked into Theodoret, and find that what he says is, that he condemned Timothy and his doctrines; but that as to deposing him it was needless, for he and Apollinaris had been deposed already.

The truth was that Damasus, notwithstanding his supposed infallibility, was at first deceived by Vitalis, the disciple of Apollinaris, one of the rival Bishops of Antioch (of whom we have before spoken, p. 27, *supra*), and believing from a confession of faith about the incarnation which he had given him, that he was orthodox, he had received him into communion. But Vitalis and his followers having subsequently refused to sign certain articles about the Trinity and the Incarnation, "Damasus," says Gregory Nazianzen, "understanding this, cast them out of the Church, and tore the libel and anathematisms which had been presented him by Vitalis, being much troubled that he had been so deceived." He gave this judgment in a Council at Rome, held in the year 377, at which *Peter, Bishop of Alexandria*, assisted. The Bishops of the East approved of what Damasus had done, and confirmed the judgment which the Pope had given against the Apollinarists; for in the Synod of Antioch, in the year 378, they signed a *decreta* or writing of the Western Bishops, which condemned their errors.¹⁶

One more word, and we have done. Dr. Geraghty, in the same letter, accuses us of having suppressed certain of his references, in proof of his extracts Nos. XIV. and XV., page 117.

This we wholly deny. All the passages and references he gave were accurately printed as he gave them. The references were "Apud Athanas, Apol. 2, contra Arian tom. i., p. 153. Theodoret. Hist. lib. 2, c. 3; yet, in writing to Mr. Collette, he says the Editor of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN suppressed his reference to St. Athanasius, which he says was St. Athanas. in "Apolog. adversus Arianos, p. 148, E. t. i., Ed. 1698, and was not *fool enough to let his readers know what Athanasius and Theodoret say* about the citation of Athanasius. If our readers do not know it, it is not our fault, but Dr. G.'s; for we have fortunately preserved his original MS., in which there are no other references given than those actually appearing in our print. The word *Ibid* being the only word omitted, and that through mere inadvertence of the printer. We suppressed nothing, but truly cited Sozomen, Socrates, and Dupin (*supra* p. 118) to show that Athanasius fled to Rome for protection, out of fear of the violence of his enemies. His calumniators (the Eusebians) may have been cited, but they refused to submit to Pope Julius's jurisdiction, though they had previously offered him the arbitration of their differences with Athanasius. In all this we see not a word to retract; nor has Dr. Geraghty impugned, much less disproved, the accuracy of one of our authorities in this matter. If either Pope Julius's letter, as given in Athanasius's works, or Theodoret assert the contrary, it proves nothing. The Eusebians, supposing they were cited, would not come. If Julius boasts like Glendower—

"I can call spirits from the vasty deep!"

We answer with Hotspur—

"Why, so can I; or so can any man."

But will they come when you do call for them?"

—1 Hen. IV.

As to Athanasius, whether formally cited or not, that he appeared *right willingly* there can be no doubt whatever, as Pope Julius was most favourable to him from the first, and he had no other chance of escaping from the unjust treatment he had received from the Arian party in the East. We have already shown how indignantly the letter of Pope Julius was received by the Council at Antioch, and how decidedly they threatened *hostility* unless he (Julius) sanctioned the deposition of the Bishops who had expelled, and the ordination of those whom they had elected in their stead!

What reason had we, then, to fear to let our readers know anything said by Julius in this letter, or to suppress the

¹⁶ See Dupin's Eccl. Hist., vol. i., title, The Apollinaris, p. 215, also Life of *Flavian*, already quoted, p. 227, where it is stated that *decreta* were signed by Meletius of Antioch, Eusebius of Samosata, Peragius of Laodicea, Eulogius of Edessa, and other Easterns.

passage from Theodoret, which we gave the accurate reference to, even as furnished by Dr. Geraghty in his letter to Mr. Collette? Again we say with Hotspur,

"And I can teach thee, coz, to shame the devil,
By telling truth; tell truth, and shame the devil."

We have now done, and think even Dr. Geraghty himself ought to feel that he is fairly vanquished by an honourable opponent, who is quite above the low arts he recklessly accuses him of. But whether he thinks so or not, we must now, and we are happy to be able to do so in perfect good humour, bid him finally, Farewell.

LORENZO BENONI.

We have just stumbled upon the book referred to in page 137, *supra*, and think the following extract worth insertion. The writer was an Italian, a native of Genoa, in which city he was educated and resided at the period.

Having received a mysterious letter, desiring him to be next morning, at twelve o'clock, at the Loggia of Banchi, in the covered Exchange of Genoa, on the side facing Via degli Orefici, Goldsmith's-street, the writer says—

"Accordingly, a little before twelve o'clock, I was in the Loggia of Banchi, walking up and down the side that faces Via degli Orefici.

"During this perambulation I was struck with surprise at the great number of priests assembled in this spot, some standing in groups, some sitting on chairs and benches, some walking up and down, as I myself was doing. One of these last, after having eyed me attentively, muttered, as he passed, some words evidently addressed to me, but the meaning of which I could not catch. Could he be my man? Under this impression, I managed to pass very near him on my first turn, when he again spoke to me. This time I did not lose a word of what he said. 'Any Masses, sir? very cheap.' I could make nothing of it; and he, no doubt, seeing as much by the blank hesitation of my countenance, turned and walked away. It was not till some time afterwards, that by inquiry and personal observation, I came to learn the meaning of this priest's words, and the motive which brought so many of his brethren to that place. While Lazzarino keeps us waiting, I may as well impart to the reader my information on the subject.

"There is scarcely any man so destitute as to die without leaving something to pay for a certain number of Masses for the benefit of his soul, or hardly any poor woman who has not, from time to time, some Masses performed, either for the soul of a deceased relative, for the cure of some sick member of her family, or for some such object. The sale of Masses, therefore, is very considerable in Italy. I purposely say the *sale*, for the Mass is paid for, and forms an essential part of a priest's income. The price varies according to the demand, exactly like the price of stocks, and like them, Masses rise or fall with the greater or less supply in the market.

"The spot where this singular exchange was held, where the price of Masses was regulated, and all transactions relative to this odd species of merchandize took place, was precisely the Loggia of Banchi, on the side facing Goldsmith's-street.

"If it was your wish to have a Mass said immediately, or if you had an investment of five hundred Masses to make, you could find what you wanted in this place. Brokers (priests of course) came to meet you and made the bargain. Suppose a priest, who had some hundreds of Masses to say, to be in want of ready money, he found there these said brokers, who took the Masses at a discount, and paid him the difference. Some of the big-wigs—Rothschilds of this Exchange—had in their pocket-books thousands and thousands of Masses. These men monopolised the ware at a good price, and then got rid of it at a profit to poor priests, their clients (especially to those from the country), and thus realised considerable gains.

"This sale of Masses sometimes gave rise to very ludicrous scenes. I have frequented the place often enough to witness a great variety of such. I shall merely note the following—

"A livery-servant, sent by his master, from Albano, a large village at a few miles' distance, was bargaining with a priest for a Mass to be celebrated at the said place. The servant had been authorised to bid as much as three francs; but it was Sunday, the weather was bad, and there were but few priests at leisure. The merchandise was looking up.

"I won't stir for less than five francs," says the priest, turning away as if to break off the conference.

"Five francs! That is unconscionable," returned the servant; "why, one might get a *Norena* for that!"

"Well, then, get your *Norena*, but you shall not have a Mass."

"The priest crossed the street, and entered a liquor shop. 'Boy, a glass of brandy!' said he to the lad behind the counter.

"The servant, who followed close at the priest's heels, turned pale. If the priest should break his fast, farewell to all hope of a Mass.

"I'll give four francs, though I am sure I shall be scolded."

"Five francs! that's my first and last word," raising the glass to his lips; "you may take it or leave it as you please."

"He was just on the point of swallowing the contents, when the servant stopped his hand, saying,

"You drive a very hard bargain; however, you shall have the five francs; and so it was settled."—p. 361-4.

DISPENSATIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—Your facetious correspondent, "A. H.," states that a schoolmistress in Paris "bought a dispensation for herself and everybody in the house to eat butcher's meat four days in the week, instead of three," during Lent. This, sir, is a common custom in France. The ordi-

nances of Lent in that country—at least in some of the dioceses—are much more rigorous than in any part of England, where each Bishop has the power of prescribing such regulations for fasting as he may think fit. For instance, in no part of England is a black fast enjoined; whereas it is in France. Perhaps the term "black fast" may not be understood by you: the meaning is, that no flesh meat of any kind whatever shall be eaten by the faithful during the forty days of Lent. To get over this difficulty "the faithful" apply to the curés of their several parishes, and give according to their means a sum of money to obtain a dispensation to eat flesh meat on several days in the week. I know an English gentleman who resided with his family in France, who was accustomed every year to put a napoleon into the hands of the curé for a dispensation for himself and family to eat flesh meat *à discretion* during Lent. This custom brings in a considerable revenue to the curés, therefore black Lents are not likely to be discontinued. It is a marvel that the practice should have ceased in England; perhaps the Reformation had something to do with it.

Mr. Bowyer, Dr. Wiseman's knight, has written to the *Times* to say that the Dundalk banquet given to the Cardinal was not on a fast day—it was only a day of abstinence; on which the editor pertinently observes, "Where's the difference?" Now, sir, let it be remarked that there is not one of those two hundred "holy men" who feasted with the Cardinal on that memorable occasion who, if a poor man confessed to him that he had flavoured his potatoes with a small piece of bacon on that Friday, would not tell him that he had committed a mortal sin, for which he must do penance. Thus the "holy confessor" may feast on "Potages, Poissons, Hors D'Œuvres, Jamon surprise, &c., &c.," in fine, on all delicacies which the sea produces, and that culinary art can make delicious to the palate; but his poor penitent, who has only greased his potatoes, is told that he has committed a sin deserving of eternal punishment! Allow me, sir, to make another remark. The man who steals a beefsteak commits, by the laws of the holy Church, a mortal sin; but should he eat a beefsteak on a Friday he commits a mortal one. Thus the laws of man overrule those of God.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,
T. E.

WHERE IS THE BARRIER AT WHICH ST. PETER SITS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—One of our Scripture Readers the other day asked a shepherd whether he knew what he must do to get to heaven? "Oh!" said he, "I know that right well, and I'm sure of it, for I often heard the master say it too, and he knows well. If the candle keeps lighting till I pass the third barrier I'm all safe." (It appears they place a lighted candle in the hand of a dying man, and let it burn out after he is dead.) "What barrier?" said the Reader. "Where St. Peter sits," said the man. "Is that in heaven or purgatory?" said the Reader. This rather puzzled him, and another man and he argued the point whether Peter was in heaven or purgatory! The reader explained the gospel plan of salvation. Two days afterwards he saw the man again at a lodging house; shaking him warmly by the hand, he said, "Well, no one in the fair knows what I am. I was awake all last night thinking of what you said, and now for the love of God come in and tell me some more." Have you ever heard of this barrier and the candle before?

Yours, faithfully, R.H.O.

THE GLORIES OF MARY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—In the September number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, p. 99, you made the following statement: "If what we must call the deification of the Virgin Mary goes on as it has done, the next step will be that she will be exalted so high that men will cease to have confidence in her willingness to condescend to listen to them, and they will seek for intercessors with her, just as she has been sought as an intercessor with her Son."

Allow me to refer you to pp. 138-9 of "The Glories of Mary," and you will find that "the step" which you so acutely conceived has already been taken. This book, you are aware, is of high authority, and "cordially recommended to the faithful" by Cardinal Wiseman. It states, then, in the pages referred to, that "Father Suarez correctly remarks, that we beg the saints to be our intercessors with Mary because she is their Queen and Sovereign Lady. 'Anoint the saints,' he says, 'we do not make use of one to intercede with the other, as all (saints) are of the same order; but we do ask them to intercede with Mary, because she is their Sovereign Queen.' And this is precisely what Saint Bernard promised to Saint Frances of Rouen, as we read in Father Marchese; for he appeared to her, and taking her under his protection, he promised that he would be her advocate with the Divine Mother."

Whilst I acquit you, sir, of any ambition to be numbered among the prophets, permit me to applaud your deep penetration.

Your, &c.,

E. M. H.

¹⁷ A religious service performed nine days running; as saleable an article as the Mass.